

**Remarks:**

The Examiner has requested restriction of the application to one of the following allegedly independent and distinct inventions:

Group I: Claims 1-45, 55 and 63-65, drawn to a compound, composition, contrast agent, or kit;

Group II: Claims 45-46, drawn to a method of preparing a compound; and

Group III: Claims 47-54, drawn to a method of using the composition.

Applicants note that claim 45 has been included in both Group I and Group II, and assume the Group I is intended to include claims 1-44, and that claim 45 is intended to be part of Group II. Also, claims 56-62 were not included in any of the groups set forth. Applicants assume that claims 56-62 would have been included in Group III.

In response to the restriction requirement, applicants elect, with traverse, the claims of Group I for prosecution at this time.

Applicants respectfully traverse the requirement for restriction. Applicants maintain that the claims of Group I, II and III are not independent and distinct. The methods of the claims of Group II are directed to making only compounds encompassed by the claims of Group I. Likewise, the methods of the claims of Group III are directed to uses only of the compounds encompassed by the claims of Group I. Therefore, the subject matter claimed in Groups I, II and III is not independent and distinct, and restriction is not proper.

The Examiner has stated that the invention does not contain a distinguishable core structure that runs through the respective compositions claimed, and that in individual structure and/or sequence search is required to be defined for the composition, with all other elements therein. Consequently, the Examiner has required that applicants elect a specific composition.

Applicants respectfully traverse this requirement. All of the claimed compounds or compositions have in common, as a single core structure, a monomer, multimer, or polymer of TKPPR or a TKPPR analog. Applicants maintain that a search focused on such compounds and compositions would not be unduly burdensome.

For the reasons set forth above, applicants maintain that the claims of the subject application do not define independent and distinct inventions, and respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement.


Nevertheless, in an effort to advance prosecution of the subject application, applicants have amended claim 1, and cancelled claims 2-3, 10-22, 40-48 and 50-65. The remaining claims 1,4, 5-9, and 23-29 are now directed to compounds and compositions useful in ultrasound imaging technologies. Claim 49 is directed to a method of ultrasound imaging using these compounds. Applicants maintain that the amendments and cancellation of claims render the restriction requirement moot. Additionally, notwithstanding that claim 49 was included in Group III, applicants request that claim 49 be examined with claims 1, 5-9 and 23-39.

No fee(s) are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fee(s) or credit any overpayment in connection with this Response to Deposit Account No. 50-0540.

If a telephone interview would advance prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 5, 2004

  
Donald L. Rhoads, Reg. No. 34,705  
W. Scott McNees, Reg. No. 33,964  
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP  
919 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
(212) 715-9100 (telephone)  
(212 ) 715-8000 (facsimile)